

E

671

M894

River and Harbor Bill and
the Dead Lock.

Speeches of: Senators

Morton, Sherman and Bout-
well. July, 1876.





Class E 671

Book .M894

5481 ✓

78

RIVER AND HARBOR BILL AND THE DEAD-LOCK.

SPEECHES

429
748

OF

Senators Morton, Sherman, and Boutwell,

July 18, 19, and 22, 1876.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, having under consideration the bill (H. R. No. 3022) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and completion of certain works on the rivers and harbors—

Mr. MORTON said :

Mr. PRESIDENT : I shall detain the Senate but a few minutes. I think it is proper to make some answer to what has been said by the Senator from North Carolina. My friend is undoubtedly sincere in what he has said to-day. He believes it all, and hence I shall not call in question his motive for any declaration. It is sometimes said that figures cannot lie; but we know that they can be placed so that they lie prodigiously. The figures which have been put into the hands of my friend from North Carolina—I know not by whom—do lie prodigiously; they come nowhere near the truth. I will ask my friend to let me see that statement about the defalcations in Johnson's administration in regard to whisky. It is very interesting.

The Senator was asked this question in the course of his remarks : What good thing has been done of any character by the democratic party in the last twenty-five years? I will ask what good thing has been done or suggested by that party in twenty-five years? I should like for any Senator on this floor to name it. I will give him the floor to name it.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I will tell the Senator. I say to him that the democratic House of Representatives at the present session have investigated and exposed the corruptions which have been practiced under the Administration which he supports; and that the various committees of that body have brought to light not only a degree of extravagance and of loose administration,

but a degree of corruption that has astonished this whole country. That is a noble service which has been rendered by the democratic party at the present session.

Mr. MORTON. We know that the democratic party has assumed the role of the detective. How much it has discovered will appear more fully when we get the evidence. But that is dodging the question. The Senator has mentioned certain investigations during this session which I think up to this time have merited chiefly and received the contempt of the country. I repeat the question. What good thing has been done or suggested by the democratic party in the last twenty-five years? I see my friend from Connecticut, [Mr. EATON,] who has an excellent memory. If there was one good thing in the history of his party for twenty-five years he would not hesitate to name it.

Mr. EATON. And he will name it before we get through with this discussion.

Mr. MORTON. When I look back I remember the fugitive-slave law in 1850; I remember the repeal of the Missouri compromise in 1854, that breach of faith which was the beginning of the war; I remember the border-ruffian outrages in 1855 and 1856; I remember the Lecompton constitution and the Dred Scott decision in 1857; I remember the democratic party in 1860 saying there was no power to coerce a State to remain in the Union; I remember its opposition to every war measure; I remember its meeting at Chicago in 1864, during the last great struggle, when every honest man knew that the rebellion was doomed unless it was saved from the North, and their declaring to the world, Mr. Tilden himself being on the committee, that the war was a failure and ought

to be abandoned. I know that in any other country in the world than this, struggling with armed rebellion, that declaration would have been punished as high treason, as it deserved to be, made at that time and under the circumstances. I remember its opposition to the abolition of slavery. I remember its opposition to the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments. I remember the counsel it gave to the South to reject all reconstruction. I remember the outrages of the Ku-Klux and white-leaguers who received protection and encouragement in the tents of the democratic party. I put the question to my friend—and I will give him the floor to answer—what good thing has his party done or even suggested in twenty-five years? Continually evil; the blackest and the most damnable record in the history of parties in this or any other country.

My friend from North Carolina talked a great deal about the expenses of the republican party. He talked about the increased expenses of the Government. He said the last four years had cost the country more to maintain this Government and carry it on than during the previous history of the Government. I do not know whether he is right about that or not; but I will assume for the sake of argument that he is; and I ask who is responsible for it? I answer, my friend and those with whom he has acted during that period. If we have incurred billions of expense, if we are now oppressed by a national debt, if we are burdened by heavy taxes, I tell him, he and those who acted with him have laid those burdens upon us. They are directly responsible; and it requires all the face—I will not say cheek—it requires all the good countenance even of my friend to stand up and say to the republicans, "You republicans did not conquer our rebellion quite as cheaply as you ought to have done; you have not handled taxation and the public debt and the other consequences growing out of our treason as well as you ought to have done. Therefore we are indignant about it. You ought to have done this business better; you ought to have whipped us at half the expense, and you did not. We propose to take the Government out of your hands and ourselves to settle with and deal with the consequences of our own crimes and blunders." That is the argument of my friend.

MR. MERRIMON. Will the Senator let me say a word?

MR. MORTON. Certainly.

MR. MERRIMON. I do not concede what the Senator said. I deny it. I deny it substantially, perhaps not altogether in detail. But suppose it was true, is it not my duty and the duty of every good man to reform these acknowledged abuses? Is that an warrant for the wholesale plunder

which I have only to a very limited extent developed here this morning?

MR. MORTON. Mr. President, the Senator does not meet the point at all. He says, suppose it is so; suppose that he and his friends are responsible for all these things, is it not his duty to reform abuses? Certainly it is; and it is his duty and those who act with him to come back and pay these debts if they could; but they cannot do it. It is in bad taste for him and others to come here and throw these things in the face of the republican party as if they were crimes upon our part, when they are but the consequences, the legitimate results of his own conduct and those who acted with him. I am not putting it in a personal sense. When the Senator arraigns the republican party for the consequences of the rebellion, I tell him it is not within his power and it is not good taste for him to hold us responsible for it.

MR. MERRIMON. That is simply a question of taste, then.

MR. MORTON. No, sir; it is no question at all. There is no question about it. If these things are the natural and legitimate consequences of the rebellion, it does not become those who were concerned in that rebellion, who helped to make it, or took any part in it, to throw it up to us as if it were a crime on our part; and that is what is continually being done. We are held responsible for the crimes, the misfortunes, and the blunders of others.

MR. MERRIMON. Are we to sit here with our mouths closed, and are we not the equals of other Senators on this floor? If not, we ought to be turned out and sent away. I take it we are sent here under the Constitution of our country to do whatever we can by our advice and by our votes and co-operation calculated to promote the best interests of the country. I am here for that purpose. If I am not here as an equal, if I am not at liberty to discuss measures and to aid in maturing them, the sooner the republican party turns me and the men like me out the better.

MR. MORTON. My friend has not been sitting all the morning with his mouth closed, we all know, [laughter;] it is his perfect right to hold the party in power responsible for any of its misdeeds, and to seek to reform abuses that now exist and make things better in the future; but that is not what I am talking about, and I do not intend to have my friend, with all his shrewdness, escape from the point. I bring him right back and tell him that all the demoralization of the times that he complains of, these vast expenses, these increased employees, and the enlargement of the civil list, all these are things that he and those who acted with him are responsible for, and they have no right to lay them at our doors as a crime or an offense.

The Senator said in the course of his argument that the republican party had accomplished all its measures by force. It was imputed to us as a crime that we had accomplished our measures by force. Sir, that is in great part true. We had to put the rebellion down by force. It required much blood and it required much treasure to put it down; and we are paying the debt every day; and even that is imputed to us as a fault, that the republican party has to accomplish its measures by force. If we attempt to protect the colored people of the South and the white republicans from the numerous slaughters that have fallen upon them in the past and from those with which they are threatened in the future, we are told that we are trying to do it by force. Ay, if we cannot do it any other way, it is our duty to do it by force. The protection of the lives of the people is the highest duty that is ever imposed upon government; and when such slaughters take place as occurred in South Carolina the other day where ten men were murdered in cold blood under circumstances of atrocity that would shame anything that has occurred in Indian warfare for years past, if we try to protect men from the repetition of those things even by force, would it not be justified?

The Senator referred to the great corruption of the republican party. He spoke about the exceeding purity of the Government under democratic administration, and how vile and how wicked it was under republican administration. I have been mingling with the democrats for a great many years and I know them pretty well everywhere.

Mr. MERRIMON. You used to belong to them.

Mr. MORTON. Yes, I did in their better days, and I suppose I shall never cease having that thing thrown up to me. I left them in 1854, twenty-one years ago and better. I am now of age in the republican party, and whenever a democrat wants to hurt my feelings he charges me with having been a democrat. [Laughter.]

Mr. MERRIMON. I can assure my friend that I did not intend to wound his feelings. I thought it very probably that was the proud part of his life.

Mr. MORTON. No, Mr. President, that is not the proud part of my life. The proud part of my life is that which was occupied in assisting in putting down the rebellion, preserving this Union, and conquering my friend and others who were in arms with him.

Mr. MERRIMON. My proudest part is the attempt to break up this corruption.

Mr. MORTON. I am coming to "this corruption" now. The Senator has brought in a statement that the Government lost during the administration of Andrew Johnson over a billion of dollars by frauds on

the revenue in regard to whisky. This illustration, like the others, is exceedingly unfortunate. It happens that it was during a democratic administration.

Mr. MERRIMON. O!

Mr. MORTON. It was when the administration of the laws was under the control and the influence of the democratic party; but my friend says that the republican party is responsible for Johnson's administration, because it elected him, just in the same way that the republican party of North Carolina is responsible for my friend's speech this morning, because they elected him. I imagine that if the republicans of North Carolina had heard my friend's speech this morning they would come to the conclusion they had done a very bad job. [Laughter;] that they had made a very bad mistake. My friend says he could not help getting their votes; he did not know about it; it was a surprise to him; he had no intimation of it, and he has never forgiven them for voting for him yet, and he was trying to punish them this morning. [Laughter.]

Mr. MERRIMON. I was very grateful for their votes.

Mr. MORTON. Ah! Grateful to those corrupt fellows for voting for him, and comes here to take Government money by the votes of a party that he describes as being the most corrupt that ever existed.

Mr. MERRIMON. I did not describe individuals in that way.

Mr. MORTON. My friend describes the republican party generally as being the most wicked and corrupt organization. It has done some good and generous things; my friend must admit that. It passed a bill enabling my friend to take a seat here and to give us the benefit from time to time of his distinguished eloquence.

Mr. President, it so happens that under the administration of Mr. Johnson, when the democratic party had full control of him and controlled his appointments, the frauds upon the revenue in the collection of the tax on whisky increased enormously, and although the tax at that time was \$20 on the gallon the last year of his administration the collection was a little over \$12,000,000, a mere bagatelle. The Senator from Ohio stated the fact here this morning. So much for democratic administration as compared with republican administration.

The most corrupt administrations this country has ever had were those that were purely democratic, and the documents in the Treasury Department show it. The most corrupt periods of our administration were under democratic rule.

Mr. MERRIMON. I ask the Senator to cite his facts.

Mr. MORTON. I am going to. That is what I am going to do, and there is where I shall have the advantage of my distin-

guished friend. My friend believes all he said this morning; but when his speech is in print, it will look like that veritable history of Baron Munchausen; but, so far as my statement is concerned, I will verify it here. I have the statement from the Treasury Department; I am going to read it. Some four or five months ago, on the 9th of February, I believe, the Senate passed a resolution calling on the Secretary of the Treasury to make a statement from the books of the Treasury of all the defalcations and failures to make settlement, from whatever cause, that had occurred in our country since the 1st of January, 1834. That embraced the last administration of General Jackson. That document was sent here and with it an analysis printed officially. It comes over the signature of the Secretary of the Treasury; it is true; it is given by detail; and it is worth ten thousand of the loose statements that my friend has made here this morning. I do not care how sincere he is in making those statements.

Mr. MERRIMON. Allow me one word?

Mr. MORTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. MERRIMON. I allowed the Senator to interrupt me whenever he wanted to. That report does not present the facts at all, and I had supposed that my friend knew it. It does not present a true state of any case that is mentioned in it, and I believe in support of this declaration I might appeal to the Senator from Rhode Island, [Mr. ANTHONY.] I remember to have had a conversation with him about that, if I may allude to the conversation at all; if it is disagreeable to him I will not.

Mr. ANTHONY. Go on sir: I do not understand what the allusion is.

Mr. MORTON. I can set that matter right. The statement is not correct in this, Mr. President, that there are defalcations put down that do not exist, that were afterwards settled; but so far as the proportion is concerned between the different administrations, so far as my purpose is concerned in the comparison I propose to make, it is the same as if every defalcation here stated took place. The objection is that the statement is not too small, but too large.

Mr. MERRIMON. My objection is—

Mr. ANTHONY. I should like to have the Senator from North Carolina state what the reference to me is. I did not hear it.

Mr. MORTON. I prefer going on. My friend has no right to anticipate my statement by coming in with a caveat in advance.

Mr. MERRIMON. The Senator from Indiana ought not to read that paper, for it does not present the facts. I have read no paper that does not present the facts as shown by the official records. That paper does not present the facts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. MORTON. I do not yield to my friend to make such a statement as that. I stated wherein

it does not present the facts, that some of those defalcations in all administrations were afterward settled or turned out to be nominal; but that pertained just as much to one as to another, and, so far as the object I have in view is concerned, it is a fair statement, because it shows the proportion in all administrations, and now I propose to give it just as it is furnished from the books of the Treasury Department, and it puts to flight ten thousand lies that are being told every day in every State and from every stump about the republican party.

Take the last administration of General Jackson. The defalcations and failures to make settlement on the thousand dollars of collection as shown by the books of the Treasury were \$10.55; in Van Buren's administration, \$21.15; in Harrison and Tyler's administration, \$10.37; in Polk's administration, \$3.34; in Taylor and Fillmore's, \$7.54; in Pierce's administration, \$5.86; in Buchanan's administration, the last democratic administration, \$6.95; in Lincoln's administration, \$1.41, and that was during the war; in Johnson's administration, forty-eight cents; in Grant's first administration, forty cents; and in the last three years of Grant's administration, twenty-six cents on the \$1,000. Here we have the statement from the Treasury Department that puts to flight all these Munchausen stories that are told about the monstrous corruption and degradation of the republican party; and I undertake to say now that all things considered, while there are defalcations, and there always will be until human nature is regenerated, and while there will be failures and short-comings and frauds, I believe to-day is the purest and best administration this country has ever had.

Mr. MERRIMON. Gracious alive!

Mr. MORTON. The Senator says "gracious alive." It requires stronger declarations than that to get over these figures. My democratic friends have but two arguments in this campaign. The argument has been, in the South, violence, intimidation; and the argument in the North is the cry of reform and corruption. The first argument is the shot-gun, the revolver, the bowie-knife, and it is sharp and murderous; and the second argument is false and hypocritical. [Applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The rules must be observed.

Mr. MORTON. I think it has been said that in the last year of Buchanan's administration, in 1860, the expenses of the Government were only \$60,000,000. Well, Mr. President, the population then was 31,000,000; it is now not less than 44,000,000; and when you take the expenditures of the Government then and compare them with the expenditures now, and the population then 31,000,000, now 44,000,000, and take out the payment of the interest on the public debt, the payment of pensions, and all the expenses brought upon us by the rebellion, I make the declaration without fear of contradiction that the expenses of the Government now are less *per capita* than they were in 1860. If they have been increased the responsibility is just where I placed it and where history will place it.

Mr. President, I should like to read this whole statement, but it is long and I will ask the privilege of incorporating it in my remarks. I mean the statement from the Treasury Department with all its details.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection.

Mr. EATON. I object. I object because it was not permitted to the honorable Senator from North Carolina to have a table printed in his remarks.

Mr. ANTHONY. Then have it read.

Mr. MORTON. I did not object to what my friend offered.

Mr. EATON. Let it be read.

Mr. MORTON. Let it be read from the beginning; it is good reading; it is in detail, and the detail and particularly will show the truth of what I said as a general statement. If my friends will have the patience to hear it read, I am sure we shall not object.

Mr. EATON. Let us hear it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the paper.

The Secretary read as follows:

STATEMENT showing the Receipts and Disbursements of the Government from January 1, 1834, to June 30, 1876, exhibiting also, the amount of defalcations and the ratio of losses per \$1,000 to the aggregate of receipts, for each year, and also in the periods prior and subsequent to June 30, 1861; prepared under the direction of the Secretary, to accompany his answer to a resolution of the United States Senate, dated February 9, 1876, calling for a detailed statement of balances due from public service, which have arisen since 1834.

RECEIPTS, LOSSES AND RATIO OF LOSS PER \$1,000 TO AGGREGATE OF RECEIPTS.

PERIOD.	CUSTOMS.				INTERNAL REVENUE.				MISCELLANEOUS.	
	Receipts.	Losses.	Loss on \$1,000.		Receipts.	Losses.	Loss on \$1,000.		Receipts.	
January 1, 1834, to December 31, 1837.	\$70,185,493 66	\$1,211,566 25	\$17 28		\$25,519 41				\$69,706,983 70	
January 1, 1838, to December 31, 1841.	78,283,444 98	264,502 94	3 33		9,954 20				26,832,173 67	
January 1, 1842, to June 30, 1845.	116,667,436 31	264,939 03	3 23		5,852 71				12,046,663 07	
July 1, 1845, to June 30, 1849.	116,667,442 31	7,719 11	1 10		3,647 26				12,046,663 07	
July 1, 1849, to June 30, 1853.	194,957,442 31	215,749 03	1 10						12,046,663 07	
July 1, 1853, to June 30, 1857.	215,749 03	131,277 05	53						12,046,663 07	
July 1, 1857, to June 30, 1861.	184,125,089 83	58,777 03	21						12,046,663 07	
July 1, 1861, to June 30, 1865.	305,360,453 01	31,251 89	10		350,846,137 30	\$42,288 60	\$1 18		12,046,663 07	
July 1, 1865, to June 30, 1869.	699,977,489 65	294,498 55	36		694,693,401 13	2,120,002 16	2 29		67,231,745 08	
July 1, 1869, to June 30, 1873.	805,248,591 98	20,353 19	02		572,399,401 98	826,265 67	1 14		91,743,084 44	
July 1, 1873, to June 30, 1876.	820,271,556 04	5,407 28	01		212,417,278 48	283,196 63	1 38		79,624,848 56	
Total	3,082,089,093 98	2,434,632 48	78		2,066,371,242 46	3,659,352 06	1 77		492,573,433 61	
January 1, 1834, to June 30, 1861.	\$961,211,003 72	\$2,124,529 49	\$2 23		\$40,023 68				\$172,680,767 70	
July 1, 1861, to June 30, 1876.	2,130,878,090 26	310,102 97	14		2,066,331,218 88	\$3,659,352 06	\$1 77		239,892,685 81	

RECEIPTS, LOSSES, AND RATIO OF LOSS PER \$1,000 TO AGGREGATE OF RECEIPTS—Continued.

PERIOD.	MISCELLANEOUS—Continued.				NET TOTAL.				GROSS TOTAL.			
	Losses.	Loss on \$1,000.	Receipts.		Losses.	Loss on \$1,000.	Receipts.*		Losses.	Loss on \$1,000.		
January 1, 1834, to December 31, 1837.	\$172,269 16	\$2 74	123,002 971 77	1,383,825 41	\$10 40	\$135,995,960 92	\$1,383,825 41		\$10 17			
January 1, 1838, to December 31, 1841.	127,825 40	4 73	94,125,536 95	382,325 54	4 16	129,948,648 91	382,325 54		3 81			
January 1, 1842, to June 30, 1845.	175,042 35	20 48	87,493,019 09	43,181 69	14	116,738,004 87	429,981 30		8 68			
July 1, 1845, to June 30, 1849.	10,390 87	80	122,857,147 61	273,270 58	1 33	211,958,612 91	18,109 98		08			
July 1, 1849, to June 30, 1853.	60,521 60	4 79	207,581,175 49	214,003 78	1 33	252,179,829 69	270,270 58		1 30			
July 1, 1853, to June 30, 1857.	81,724 73	2 80	282,172,927 89	194,003 83	1 33	312,359,679 66	213,001 78		75			
July 1, 1857, to June 30, 1861.	165,227 89	12 00	198,983,373 20	508,493 60	1 49	4,670,460,137 61	508,493 60		10			
July 1, 1861, to June 30, 1865.	53,943 01	1 97	1,710,418,954 21	2,659,721 90	1 49	2,652,316,438 44	2,561,721 90		63			
July 1, 1865, to June 30, 1869.	181,691 29	1 35	1,457,292,842 50	964,698 88	65	2,678,643,586 72	964,698 88		68			
July 1, 1869, to June 30, 1873.	107,497 86	1 89	583,901,862 25	7,255,619 41	55	1,450,222,856 62	322,183 92		22			
July 1, 1873, to June 30, 1876.	35,581 01	2 51	6,611,033,759 95	\$2,907,521 31	1 29	14,100,631,405 09	7,255,619 41		61			
Total	1,161,694 89	\$4 63	\$1,123,931,795 00	\$4,348,098 10	\$2 58	\$1,390,986,145 18	\$2,907,521 31		\$4 69			
January 1, 1834, to June 30, 1861.	\$782,901 82	1 80	\$1,487,101,984 95		98	12,709,646,059 91	4,348,098 10		24			
July 1, 1861, to June 30, 1876.	378,643 07											

*Includes receipts for loans.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, (July 19,) resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. No. 3022) making appropriations for the construction, repair, preservation, and completion of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, the pending question being on the motion of Mr. THURMAN to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to reduce the aggregate amount of the appropriations contained in the bill to a sum not exceeding \$4,000,000.

Mr. SHERMAN. * * * The Senator probably was not aware how broad and sweeping these charges made by him of corruption were or he certainly would not have indulged in them. Then, when you come to look at his argument, this was one of them, and the principal one: that the tax on whisky was \$2 a gallon, and somebody had said, I do not know who, that 100,000,000 gallons of whisky were made in a year.

Mr. MERRIMON. Mr. Fessenden said so in 1864.

Mr. SHERMAN. I remember the remark made by Mr. Fessenden. He was one of twenty million republicans who made an error. There never have been 100,000,000 gallons of whisky made since the tax was imposed. It was estimated in 1860 that there were 100,000,000 gallons made, by the census returns, at a time when whisky was worth fourteen or fifteen cents a gallon; but then it was consumed in burning fluid and in a thousand ways that it cannot be consumed now; but since the tax has been levied on it it has never reached anything like that proportion. Mr. Fessenden simply said that prior to 1860 it was estimated that the whisky produced in this country was 100,000,000 gallons; and upon this fact, detached, separated, the Senator says that the republican party ought to have collected from the people of the United States \$200,000,000 a year.

In the first place, no one was foolish enough in the beginning of our internal-revenue taxation to propose a tax of \$2. It was a foolish venture. We put on a smaller tax, commencing with twenty cents, and we collected more revenue then than with the two dollars' tax. We gradually raised it until 1866. It was demanded by public sentiment that we should do what we did in 1866. We then raised the tax to \$2 a gallon, and that tax remained three or four years. During all the time from 1861 to 1865 the honorable Senator by his logic charges the republican with losing this Government \$200,000,000 a year, less the amount of tax we actually collected; and that is the kind of argument on which he goes to the people to show that the republican party was corrupt!

It so happened that when this two-dollar tax was levied the democratic party had control of the executive authority of the Govern-

ment; it had the President. It is true we elected Mr. Johnson; we made mistake in doing it and we never cease to regret our mistake. Mr. Johnson turned over the whole executive power of the Government to the democratic party, and the Senator has presented a numerous list, which contains hundreds of names of men on this list who were defaulters, but I would not read them lest some of them might not have been but there are on it the names of men appointed by Mr. Johnson who are now active leaders in the democratic party, because most of those who went over with Mr. Johnson went into the democratic party. During that time when there was a two dollar tax we are charged with wasting and squandering \$200,000,000 a year collected from the whisky tax, of which ought to have been collected! Why, sir, under the administration of Andrew Johnson the tax collections on whisky went down to twelve millions in a single year. The republican party, however, was charged with the responsibility of the Government. Were we not anxious to collect this tax? Was it not our interest to collect the tax? Did we not pass laws as severe as the Draconian code? Did we not use every effort to collect this tax? And yet under President Johnson we could not do it. Why? Partly because the political disputes of the time made it difficult to collect internal taxes because of bad appointments or differences between the Senate and the President as to appointments, but it was mainly because the law was wrong. We ought never to have attempted in our broad country to put on a tax of \$2 a gallon, and we made the discovery that we had made a mistake and in a short time we repealed that law and then we commenced collecting the whisky tax. After we reduced the tax down to fifty cents, I believe that the whisky tax was as thoroughly and completely collected as any tax could be. The only difficulty in collecting the whisky tax after that time was in the States of North Carolina, Tennessee, and other southern sparsely populated States. In the great cities for several years when the tax ranged between fifty and sixty cents a gallon it was collected with great exactitude, great correctness; but there was a difficulty in collecting it in some of the southern and sparsely populated States; there force had to be used to collect it; the Army had to be employed more or less to a considerable extent, but all was collected that could be collected. So it continued.

Now, to make this loss of the whisky tax the substratum of this great effort it seems to me was not treating the Senate of the United States with that proper respect with which it is necessary to be treated. If this was a popular argument to be used in the campaign in North Carolina, the Senator might have reserved it until

he went down there to make a speech to that people, where documents could not be produced at once to correct him; but made here in the Senate Chamber he must have expected that it would excite indignation, reply, remark, and exposure if it was not correctly and well founded. That is all the feeling I had about it; but if there was a little heat—I am sorry I had it—it was but natural when the Senator was arraigning us as a set of scoundrels and rascals corrupting the whole party—

Mr. MERRIMON. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. SHERMAN. The language was most broad that the republican party was the most corrupt that had ever existed.

Mr. MERRIMON. I said expressly in the commencement of my speech that there were in the republican party, as in every other party, good men.

Mr. SHERMAN. But they must be "few and far between," according to the Senator's general declamation. We are sensible men here, and we know very well that the great mass of all political parties of our countrymen are honest, desire to do their duty to their country, to their families, to their God, to themselves; and therefore this broad declamation against parties ought not to be indulged in. We have a right, however, to arraign the official conduct of parties, but in doing so should give particulars; and therefore when the Senator was thus declaiming I asked him, if the republican party was so bad, what had the democratic party done for the last forty years that would induce him to go for it or that would command his respect. My friend from Indiana spread that question a little further, and wanted to know what good measure the democratic party had ever adopted. It is a remarkable fact, Mr. President, and I may as well put in here as this is a political discussion, that there is not a single position taken by the democratic party for the last thirty years on which they now dare to make a stand and defend it. You may look over the whole political arena and you will find it to be so. I say when you contrast the position of these two great parties, what they have done, what they have proposed, where they stand, the contrast may be drawn by any intelligent man. I say the democratic party has been compelled to abandon and recede from every position it has taken, and it will not now in this canvass in which it seeks again to come into power stand upon any position it has taken for the last thirty years.

But, sir, its cry is reform. Well, every honest man is in favor of reform. There never will be a period in the history of mankind that reform will not be an imperative demand. Crimes, offenses, are continually occurring; there will be efforts against the interests of the mass of mankind. There has been a continual strug-

gle since Adam was born in this world of ours between good and evil; but we have come to believe that in this Republic of ours good has been in the ascendant and evil has been sent to the penitentiary. Such has been our common thought and among men of all political parties.

But, sir, we are now told that the democratic House, where they have a casual democratic majority, have unearthed corruptions, exposed frauds, shown that the people have been robbed; and we naturally inquire where, when, by whom? And now, gentlemen, it will not do for you to talk about corruption and fraud and dishonesty and wrong in a general hap-hazard way as something that will be disclosed, some bugaboo that will be developed after a while. Where is it? Who has stolen the public money? Name your man. It will not do for my honorable friend from Delaware to say O, well, somebody has plundered the Government to the extent of \$300,000 in some contracts, but I do not want to name him? That is not the way. The names have got to be given, the place, the time, the circumstances.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I refer the Senator to the report of the Committee on Naval Affairs where he will find it all given.

Mr. SHERMAN. It was an unfortunate remark for the Senator to make. During the last democratic administration that governed the country the House of Representatives, by a resolution passed by the votes of men of both political parties, denounced the administration of the Naval Department then in terms stronger than can be used now and for the same class of contracts that have been investigated into recently. But I do not wish to go into that; "sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof." I do not believe that when the report is made and it comes to be discussed, any wrong or fraud will rest upon the head of that Department, and if there is, the republicans will be as swift to punish him as the Senator can be; but until then he is bound as an honest and honorable man to consider him innocent.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I have not said a word against the head of the Navy Department; I have not referred to him.

Mr. SHERMAN. We ought not to deal in insinuations. I naturally leaped to the conclusion that there was some wrong or fraud to be disclosed by some committee of the House in regard to the Navy Department, and necessarily its head. Now, sir, ought we to deal in such imputations? Are men's characters to be made a football of? If the House makes any allegation against any member of this Government we are bound to try him, as judges, sworn under our oath in the particular case, and we have no right to prejudice. The only particular cases that my friend from Delaware gave us—he was unfortunate there—were those of a defaulting paymaster of

the army of the United States and a man convicted of whisky frauds. Paymasters are generally men selected in honor. The Senator gave his name as Major Hodge. Well, Major Hodge was a defaulter; but he was tried, convicted and sent to the penitentiary for his defalcation. I understood he was a Democrat always. I knew his father before him. He was in the regular army. Would you hold the Republican party responsible for his defalcation because he gambled away the public money, lost it, and squandered it? I hear a Senator say we ought to have known it. Are we omniscient? Is the Democratic party omniscient? O, no. The very moment his offense was detected he was punished and sent to the penitentiary. I know it is claimed that he was pardoned. I hear it said, "Grant pardoned him." So he did, on the demand of numberless Democrats high in official position. If he did wrong he did the wrong of being merciful to a man who had violated his public duty.

Mr. LOGAN. He pardoned the Ku-Klux, too, on the same kind of recommendations.

Mr. SHERMAN. It is not on such premises as that that a great party like the Republican party is to be tried and convicted. And you say there were McDonald and McKee—my honorable friend saw them within the bars of the State prison. Who put them there? What Democrat shared in that work? Not a Democrat. They were put there by Republicans; and when did a Democratic administration put a Democrat behind the bars of a penitentiary for official misconduct? Tell me the case, when, where, and under what administration. But unfortunately they say Dyer, Pratt, and others have been removed; and we are brought in and arraigned, not for offences charged against the Republican party, but because in our administration the Secretary of the Treasury resigns, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue resigns, or disputes, coldness, or disagreement arise in the administration of the Government, and we are at once charged, because these men retire from office, with seeking to shield the guilty instead of protecting innocence. Ah, gentlemen, you must do something better than that if you wish to make an arraignment against the Republican party.

But some one said, I think my friend from North Carolina, or perhaps my friend from Delaware, that we had squandered \$3,000,000 in the Southern States from the judiciary fund. Why, sir, what became of that \$3,000,000? It was the money expended in putting down the Ku-Klux organization, the most infamous organization in modern history since the time of some of those in India, which disgraced the civilization of the old countries. Three million dollars were spent for that purpose, and no doubt some money was wasted,

some was defrauded; but that occurs in the administration of every large fund of this kind; there is petty peculation which plunders and robs from the public as well as from private individuals. Public crime as well as private crime exists in every community, in every State, in every land, in the quiet hamlet, in the Connecticut village at well as in the border regions far remote. There will be vice and crime everywhere; it accompanies all agencies that are human, and we cannot avoid it entirely. All we can say in reply is that when these peculations occur we expose them and we punish them; and when we contrast our conduct and our administration with that of others gone before us, ours is far more favorable than theirs.

Here is the official statement of the actual losses that occurred during our war. They are all honorable to us. Scarcely any money was lost in our war by defalcation and peculation; I say scarcely any in proportion to the percentage of other losses. Take the case of the internal revenue, the very service that was sought to be saddled with \$20,000,000 of unaccounted balances. Take that case and we have the fact that only \$2,376,000 have been lost of all the taxes that have been levied in the form of internal taxation since the organization of the system to the last year, or one-thirteenth of one-thousandth of 1 per cent.

There is another remarkable fact shown in our military history. I have not the statement before me, but I saw the statement made that the losses—including Major Hodge's defalcation, which is one of the largest—that occurred by paymasters and other disbursing officers in our war, compared with the Prussian service, the English service, or any service of which we had a record, was only about one-tenth of the amount. The actual fidelity in the disbursements of public men after the war and during the war is almost unprecedented in the history of mankind.

You, gentlemen, have now had the full power of this Government. You have an organized House, whose sole purpose has been to delve in and try to find if we have been guilty of rascality or wrong. They have ample means, ample ability, and what has been the outcome? You tell us that something will be disclosed when the reports are printed. Can it be possible that these men are withholding their reports in order to prevent us from answering them, or to prevent the men whom they accuse from answering them in the proper way? I trust not. I do not believe it, and will not believe it. They have here and there fallen upon delinquents. Men of both political parties have been struck at by these committees. They may not have been groping in the right direction, but wherever they groped they found a Democrat; and they found, no doubt,

some bad Republicans. But if this is to be a campaign of scandal, if this is to be a campaign of abuse, then I warn gentlemen that the people of this country are a kind-hearted people. I never saw an intelligent crowd in Ohio but what turned with loathing and disgust from a man who addressed them in the language of calumny and reproach. Go to that people, talk to them plain, common sense; be the orator ever so dull, be he ever so witty, they will bear it all; they will take a joke in kind, good humor; but commence your strain of calumny and reproach by trying to prove that Grant is a rascal and that all these Republicans who have carried the Republican banner in triumph, in peace and in war, are scoundrels, and they will turn their backs upon you unless you bring facts, figures, names and dates, and prove your charges. Sir, your campaign of scandal and slander will be at an end in thirty days after it has commenced. Your cry of reform will require something else than mere empty air. The people will ask what security do you, the Democratic party, give us for reform. Why is Governor Tilden any more likely to reform this Government than Governor Hayes? What is there in the character of these two men that gives one, Tilden, the pre-eminence over Hayes as a reformer? What is there in the conduct of your party that gives you the right to claim to be reformers? You have been driven from all your positions; you do not stand where you stood at any time within the last thirty years. Sir, the people will know who are these prophets of reform before they trust them. You must show something else than the history of the last few years in the Southern States; you must show something else in the nature of reform before they will trust the old associates of Tweed in New York; you must show that the Democratic party has in its elements of reform which will give some security for their promises; otherwise the people will not heed your talk about reform.

Sir, I again express my regret to the Senate that I have been led to participate in this debate. I think myself we ought to leave this question to the people of the United States and let them discuss it in their assemblages all over this broad land of ours; and my hope is that, although they may see here and there something to find fault with in the course of the Republican party or the Republican leaders, they will think on the whole it is better for the North and South to trust that strong, powerful political organization that has guided our country through the perils of war, that has secured reconstruction, and on the whole has given to the country a wise administration of affairs.

I appeal to my friends from the Southern States, because I think I can say that at least I am not their enemy, that the

time has not arrived when the Democratic party can again come into power in this country. Its history during recent events has not been such as to excite the hopes and emotions that ought to follow the success of a great political party. It is better for the South that a good man who will be fair and honest and straightforward, true to his word, manly in every undertaking, bold in execution of every promise, should preside over this Government for four years longer before you revive again in a popular contest the old struggle between the Democratic and Republican parties. At all events I pray my Democratic friends not to commence it here by gross exaggeration, by wholesale calumny, by charges that will never be proven, and by pretenses that have not been justified by the past history of the Democratic party.

Mr. BOGGS. I move that the Senate adjourn.

RIVER AND HARBOR BILL.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, July 22, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. No. 3022) making appropriations for the construction, repair, preservation, and completion of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, the pending question being on the motion of Mr. THURMAN to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to reduce the aggregate amount of the appropriations contained in the bill to a sum not exceeding \$4,000,000.

Mr. BOUTWELL. Mr. President, I agree with much that has been said by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL] in regard to the condition of the country, and I disagree entirely to the theory that if the condition of affairs for the moment were as unfavorable as represented by gentlemen on the other side, therefore necessary expenditures on public works should be omitted. Whatever may be the condition of affairs to-day, nothing can be more certain than that the country has in the future a career of prosperity. We have credit; we have resources; and above all we have great capacity for labor. Now, so far as public works have been undertaken, the undertaking of which was wise, it is more wise to prosecute them and prosecute them with vigor under the circumstances that exist, and if the circumstances were more unfavorable so with stronger reason ought we to prosecute these works.

The reasons are two: first, they can be now prosecuted to completion at less cost than they can be when the affairs of the country are in a more favorable condition, and second, although I would not undertake public works, and especially those not necessary, for the purpose of giving employment to the people, yet, when public works are undertaken and when those works are necessary, there can be no

higher duty resting upon a Government which has both resources in property and resources in credit than to prosecute those words to successful completion.

A government should be above the reach of panics, which necessarily affect individuals, and under unfavorable circumstances we should exhibit courage, not only because the exhibition of courage is favorable in a pecuniary point of view to the Government itself, but we set an example to people who otherwise would be in lacking courage, and they will take advantage of opportunities which in a less degree are equally favorable to their own fortunes. Now, if our friends on the other side will excuse me for the statement of a fact which occurred during the war, I will venture to make it. In the darkest days, when our enemies were pressing us at every point along the line and when from the steps of this Capitol you could hear the reverberation of the cannon across the Potomac, we voted an appropriation for the completion of this Capitol. It was notice, whether taken or not, it was notice, and it was so given to our then enemies, that we did not intend to abandon this Capitol.

Now, there are in this bill appropriations that I think are unnecessary, and to me they are very disagreeable, and I am at this moment quite in doubt whether I shall vote for the bill or against it; but the time is coming, if it has not now arrived, when the representatives of the people, without distinction of party, will resist appropriations for works which, whether constitutional or not, have no such national importance that they ought to be undertaken and executed at the public expense; and unquestionably there are in this bill such appropriations and similar appropriations have been made in years past. But we are all concerned in putting an end to such drains upon the Treasury which profit nothing in a large sense probably. By the States and by the people where these works are the attempt would never be made for their execution. We ought to unite and abandon this system of making appropriations in one State because men in another State want other appropriations and stand as representatives of States upon the fact. If the representatives of a State can satisfy their associates here that the works for which they ask appropriations are national works and the country is in a condition to undertake those works, let the work be undertaken. But in this bill there are appropriations for improvements which are not national, which if anything are local, and which ought never to find countenance in the Congress of the United States. What I shall do about this bill in the end I cannot say, but I am at present in favor of recommending it in the hope that the committee will strike out all these appro-

priations that are not national, whether the works have been undertaken or whether they are new ones, and let us for once, if we can, pass a bill which, whether it appropriates \$2,000,000 or \$6,000,000, we can stand upon and say to our constituents and to the country, "These appropriations are made for important public national works that will yield a return in the facilities that will be afforded to the commerce and business of the country."

Now, Mr. President, I depart from the particular subject before the Senate for the purpose of introducing a document which I have had in my desk for many months waiting for just this occasion: a statement prepared at the Treasury with great care, showing the net expenses of the Government in the years 1860, 1810, 1820, 1830, 1840, 1850, 1860, 1870 and 1875. There is a minute and analytical comparison of the expenses of the Government in 1860 and 1875, excluding in the latter year all those expenditures which arose from the war, and there are tables containing items of the expenditures which are thus excluded, so that, if the whole shall be printed, any person who chooses to examine will have an opportunity to see whether those items classed as belonging to the war are properly so classed. This table was prepared under the direction of and by Mr. Charles F. Conant, who is now Assistant Secretary of the Treasury. His letter to me is dated at the Treasury Department, Washington, September 16, 1875. He says:

I inclose herewith tables showing the comparative expenses of the Government for the years 1875 and 1860, excluding war charges.

Mr. Conant is the responsible person for this document and upon my request made it. The total expenditures for the fiscal year 1875 were \$274,623,393.84; the total expenditures for the year 1860 were \$63,025,788.98. After deducting the expenditures for the year 1875 on account of the war—and there are appended to this, which I will have printed, analytical tables, showing what these deductions are—the net result is that the expenditures for the year 1875 were \$84,778,762.49 in currency, but the expenditures in 1860 were in gold. Mr. Conant has deducted 12 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., as the premium on gold for the year 1875, leaving a net expenditure in gold for that year of \$74,028,688.09. Then there are deductions made both from the expenditures of the year 1860 and of the year 1875 growing out of the method of keeping the books of the Department. Upon that point there is an analytical statement of the deductions and also a note showing the reason for them. He says:

The following items which are included in the aggregate as expenditures both for the years 1860 and 1875 are deducted from each for the reason that they are not expenditures in the true meaning of the word, as they involve no outlay of money by the Treasury and are no burden upon the taxpayers, they being merely entries on both the debit and credit side of the books (made necessary

by the system of book-keeping in the Department) of moneys received from persons and subsequently returned to them or expended in their behalf, namely.

And then he gives the items in each year. After deducting the amounts thus placed to the debit and credit side of the books for the years 1860 and 1875, respectively, the result is that the expenditures for the year 1875, excluding the war expenditures, deducting the premium on gold, excluding the amounts placed to the debit and credit side of the books in the Department, were \$69,856,117.77. The expenditures upon the same basis for the year 1860 were \$61,402,408.64.

Mr. BOGGS. By whom is the table furnished?

Mr. BOUTWELL. By Mr. Conant, the present Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. BOGGS. It is not official, is it? because it states facts that cannot be official. They are absurd. The premium on gold certainly can play no part in the expenses. In 1860 gold was the only coin used, and it cannot properly be added or deducted. It plays no part. This is an individual table.

Mr. BOUTWELL. Senators will deal with the processes as they think justice requires; but Mr. Conant—and in that I concur—had deducted from the currency expenses of the year 1875 the premium on gold, so that the expenses are represented ultimately in this table as gold expenses in 1860 and gold expenses in 1875.

Mr. BOGGS. The premium on gold can correctly play no part in a table of that kind. It is not correct at all. It can be neither added nor deducted; it cannot be treated as an item at all.

Mr. BOUTWELL. I desire now to call the attention of the Senate to the tables showing the expenses *per capita* in each of the years which I will mention.

The expenses *per capita*, including slaves who paid no part of the expenses of the Government directly, were in—

1800.....	\$2.038
1810.....	1 171
1820.....	1 897
1830.....	1 176
1840.....	1 424
1850.....	1 766
1860.....	1 952
1870.....	1 781

In 1875, estimating the population at 40,000,000, which was the estimate of the Treasury Department, the expenses *per capita* \$1,746.

But, estimating the population in 1875 43,000,000, which is my own opinion upon the best information I can obtain, the expenses were \$1,060 for each inhabitant, including those who had formerly been slaves. This table I will hand to the reporter with a request that the whole of it may be printed.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Does it contain any items which the Senator has not read?

Mr. BOUTWELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I believe the rule was applied to this side of the chamber that it must be read, or otherwise it ought not to go into the *Record*.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Very well, let it be read. We cannot dispense with it.

Mr. HAMLIN. It is done every day.

Mr. BOUTWELL. I hope the Senator from Delaware will not object to these tables being printed. The tables show the items of deductions made on account of the war expenses, and are very necessary to a proper understanding of the tables themselves and also furnish the evidence by which the correctness of the estimates here made will be ascertained, either established or refuted. I should not like to withdraw them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to allowing the tables to be printed in the *Record*?

Mr. BOUTWELL. It will take a couple of hours to read them, I dare say.

Mr. BOGGS. The table is the work of a gentleman who may be holding office, but it is not an official paper at all, and does not pretend to be an official paper. But taking the figures stated by the Senator from Massachusetts, they would show that the expenses of the Government are now, or were in 1875, about \$150,000,000. The total amount of expenses mentioned in that document, unofficial as it is, is \$274,000,000, from which should be deducted fairly about \$100,000,000 for the interest on the public debt; it is a little less than \$100,000,000, but call it \$100,000,000 in round numbers; and \$30,000,000 for the pension list.

Mr. EDMUNDS. How about Southern claims?

Mr. BOGGS. Taking these two main items from \$274,000,000, there will remain about \$144,000,000, or say \$150,000,000 in round numbers as the expenses of the Government other than expenses created for the army or the navy, or what the gentleman from Vermont has so often stated have grown out of the late unfortunate war. Nevertheless the fact remains that the expenses are about \$144,000,000 or \$150,000,000, besides the amount paid for interest and the amount paid for the pension list. I have no objection to the statement being published; I have no objection to the facts going before the country, no matter where they come from; but this is not an official document; it is the mere production of a gentleman who may be holding office, but it has no evidence of official character even, and some of his items are, in my estimation, very absurd and should not be in a statement of this character.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I move that the Senate adjourn. I think there is not a quorum present.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. President—

Mr. BOUTWELL. I believe I have the floor, and I wish this paper to be read as part of my speech if there is objection to its going in the *Record* without being read.

Mr. HOWE. Is there objection?

Mr. EDMUNDS. I should like much to hear it, as its accuracy is assailed.

Mr. HAMLIN. I rise, Mr. President, to a question of order, that no objection prevents a Senator from incorporating such a paper in his remarks. It is done almost every day.

Mr. EDMUNDS. He can have it read by a majority vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that there is no rule of the Senate on the subject. A majority of the Senate can determine the matter in the judgment of the Chair. The Chair will submit the question, if it is the desire of the Senator, whether this statement shall be incorporated in the Record without being read. Senators, those in favor of this permission will say aye; if of a contrary opinion will say no.

Mr. STEVENSON. I ask for the yeas and nays on that question of order. It is an important question of order.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SAULSBURY. On account of the appeals made to me by my friends on this side of the House, I will withdraw, if it is not too late, the objection, while my own judgment is that it has been the rule of the Senate not to permit statements to be incorporated in the Record which are not read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being withdrawn, the point of order falls, and the statement will be incorporated in the Record.

The tables produced by Mr. Boutwell are as follows:

Comparison of the Expenditures of 1875 with those of 1860.

Objects of Expenditures.	1860.	1875.	Increase.
A. Congress.	\$5,187,012 47	\$2,601,536 38	
B. Executive.	10,752,860 68	2,980,065 67	
C. Judiciary.	4,187,623 21	1,385,876 07	
D. Territorial Governments.	250,416 77		
E. Miscellaneous.	10,767,918 13	4,678,472 12	
F. Penitentiaries.	48,071,607 72	28,016,528 53	
G. Military establishments.	8,384,656 82	8,384,656 82	
H. Naval establishments.	20,456,216 22	20,456,216 22	
I. Interest on public debt.	41,120,645 98	4,801,416 34	
Total.	274,623,392 84	189,440,630 35	
Deduct 12 1/2 per cent., the average premium on gold during the year, the expenditures here given being in currency, while those of 1860 were in gold.			
K. Deduct items which are not really expenditures, but which appear so by reason of the system of book-keeping in practice in the Department.			
Excess of expenditures of 1875 over 1860.	88,586,117 77		
	4,172,570 32		
	74,028,688 09		
	61,462,408 64		
	1,623,380 34		
	\$3,028,768 98		

Table showing expenditures per capita.

Year.	Population	Expenditures	Per capita.
1800.....	5,805,925	\$10,513,971 01	2.088
1810.....	7,239,814	8,474,733 87	1.171
1820.....	9,633,134	13,235,533 69	1.807
1830.....	12,866,020	15,142,198 26	1.178
1840.....	17,069,453	24,314,518 19	1.424
1850.....	23,191,876	40,948,388 12	1.768
1860.....	31,493,321	61,462,408 64	1.952
1870.....	38,553,983	68,684,515 92	1.781
1875 (estimated).....	40,000,000	69,856,117 77	1.746

Note.—For explanations of deductions see accompanying statements marked A to K, inclusive.

STATEMENT A.—Congress.

Reporting debates in Congress.....	\$45,625 00
Printing for Congress, including debates.....	259,527 38
Printing for Treasury Department.....	136,000 00
Printing for War Department.....	43,254 00
Printing for Interior Department.....	102,000 00
Printing for Department of Justice.....	5,100 00
	501,356 38

STATEMENT B.—Executive.

	Expenses in 1860.	Expenses in 1875.	Increase.
Salaries in Treasury Department:			
Office of Secretary.....	\$47,931 00	\$476,689 97	\$65,600 00
First Auditor.....	35,470 00	72,908 81	37,438 81
Second Auditor.....	35,470 00	268,583 22	233,113 22
Third Auditor.....	132,905 70	246,801 97	113,896 27
Fourth Auditor.....	27,737 80	77,697 46	49,959 66
Fifth Auditor.....	17,621 43	51,304 83	33,683 40
First Comptroller.....	23,340 00	72,454 75	44,114 75
Second Comptroller.....	28,840 00	110,926 97	84,086 97
Treasurer.....	26,751 15	414,361 44	387,610 29
Register.....	61,707 11	242,837 50	181,130 39
Comptroller of Treasury.....		184,764 01	184,764 01
War Dept. and its Bureaus.....	145,584 02	972,535 17	826,951 15
Navy Dept. and its Bureaus.....	107,330 00	121,735 20	14,405 20
Interior Dept., Pension Office.....	126,206 46	494,821 21	368,614 75
Int. Rev. Office.....			335,166 80
			2,899,065 67

STATEMENT C.—Judiciary.

The expenses of courts incurred on account of internal revenue suits are estimated by the First Comptroller at one-third of the total expenditures, or..... \$1,265,576 07

STATEMENT D.—Foreign Intercourse.

Salaries and expenses of the United States and British Claims Commission.....	2,093 25
Awards to British claimants.....	1,929,819 00
Salaries and expenses, court of commissioners of Alabama claims.....	84,847 79
	2,016,286 95

STATEMENT E.—Miscellaneous.

Payment of judgments, Court of Claims	516,551 35
Salaries and expenses southern claims commission.....	51,800 00
Examination of national banks and bank-note plates.....	705 75
Expenses of engraving and printing.....	1,581,669 41
Expenses of national currency.....	330,978 27
Expenses of national loan.....	2,411 47
Refunding national debt.....	150,255 31
Refunding proceeds of cotton seized.....	51,229 47
Payment for lands sold for direct taxes.	22,920 00
Return of proceeds and expenses of collection of captured property.....	881,249 84
Refunding taxes illegally collected.....	503 00
Re-issuing national currency.....	64,244 78
Support of free schools in South Carolina.....	3,900 00
Refunding excess of duty to national banks.....	258 40
Defending suits and claims for seizure of captured property.....	26,124 00
Compensation of persons employed in insurrectionary States.....	4,068 63
Expenses of assessing and collecting internal revenue.....	5,153,513 31

Support of Freedman's Hospital and Asylum.....	50,000 00
National Association for Relief of Colored Women and Children.....	10,000 00
Compensation in lieu of mofities.....	67,134 18
Postage in lieu of franking privilege....	1,022,165 13
Extraordinary expenses incurred for the District of Columbia:	
Payment of indebtedness.....	\$1,300,000 00
Payment of interest on 3.65 loan.....	154,554 64
Public buildings and improving rivers and harbors in 1875.....	15,355,012 30
Expended for same purposes in 1860.....	2,013,371 48
Expenses of collecting revenue from customs, including revenue cutter service, in 1875.....	5,006,673 10
Cost for same service in 1860.....	3,321,439 53
	4,682,247 57
	23,613,523 53

STATEMENT F.—*Pensions.*

The entire amount on account of pensions is deducted, as it is not reasonable to suppose that many persons who would be entitled to the benefits of the old pension laws are now living.....\$92,456,216 22

STATEMENT G.—*Military establishment.*

Bounty under act of July 23, 1868.....	227,111 41
Traveling expenses of California volunteers and Michigan cavalry.....	12,185 15
Bureau of Refugees and Freedmen.....	34,716 20
Horses and other property lost in military service.....	33,720 63
Reimbursing States' expenses in suppressing rebellion.....	136,657 93
Claims of loyal citizens for supplies furnished during the rebellion.....	1,263,170 40
Publication of official records of the war of rebellion.....	20,000 00
Commutation of rations to prisoners of war.....	4,000 00
Stoppages or fines due National Home for Disabled Volunteers.....	911,595 12
Expenses under reconstruction acts.....	240 04
Bounty and prize money to colored soldiers and sailors.....	80,000 00
Keeping, transporting, and supplying prisoners of war.....	2,195 35
National cemeteries.....	163,869 59

Head-stones for graves in national cemeteries.....	134,939 17
Medical and Surgical History of the War.....	40,000 00
Total of claims actually paid.....	8,171,371 07
Increased expenditures of the Army in consequence of the war:	
1860.	1875.
Pay of the Army.....	\$3,824,924 55
Comis'y Dept.....	2,745,162 67
Q. M. Dept.....	6,470,472 53
	12,950,268 22
	13,044,559 80
	26,672,358 35
	13,627,798 53
	16,799,169 62

STATEMENT H.—*Naval establishment.*

Prize money to captors.....	842,582 22
Bounty for destruction of enemy's vessels.....	50,419 32
Payment to officers and crew of United States Steamer Kearsarge.....	2,040 87
Navy pensions.....	96,353 92
Extraordinary expenditure on account of construction of four new vessels.....	4,000,000 00
	4,991,406 34

STATEMENT I.—*Public debt.*

Interest on the public debt.....173,693,544 57

STATEMENT K.

The following items which are included in the aggregate as expenditures both for the years 1860 and 1875, are deducted from each for the reason that they are not expenditures in the true meaning of the word, as they involve no outlay of money by the Treasury and are no burden upon the tax-payers, they being merely entries on both the debit and credit side of the books (made necessary by the system of book-keeping in practice) of moneys received from persons and consequently returned to them or expended in their behalf, namely:

Items.	1860.	1875.
Refunding excess of amounts deposited by importers for unascertained duties.....	\$314,826 87	\$1,803,657 85
Debentures and drawbacks.....	585,158 39	1,626,562 17
Refunding duties erroneously or illegally collected.....	3,821 55	9,810 36
Patent fund.....	219,573 53	672,539 37
Total.....	1,623,359 34	4,172,570 32

Democratic Reform and their Platform Examined.

In the House, July 31, 1876, Hon. JACOB THORNBURG said:

*** Mr. Speaker, it provokes both a smile and feeling of indignation to hear the charge made against the republican party by the democracy that the expenses of the Government are increased and too great, that taxes are burdening the people, that there are too many clerks and employees in the Departments, and our wicked extravagance has brought it about. Do they think the memory of the American people is so short as to forget that the democratic party of the South entered into a four years' rebellion, and was aided and encouraged by many of their northern brethren who are co-operating with them to-day? Do they suppose the people do not know that billions of treasure was a part of the price we paid to preserve the union of the States and make this happy centennial rejoicing possible? Do they not know who laid these burdens that are so hard to bear on our shoulders? We pay to-day about ninety millions interest on the money we borrowed to put down the rebellion. We pay about thirty millions more pensions to disabled Union soldiers, their widows and orphans; we pay many millions more to officers of the regular Army on the retired list; for the examination and payment of claims for supplies taken; increase of clerical force to regulate and preserve the enormous records accumulating from a four years' war with two millions of men on the rolls—all this growing directly out of the rebellion. Yet the men engaged in that rebellion and those in full sympathy with them then as now are loudest in bitter denunciation of the extravagance of the republican party; or, to quote the language of an able Senator, they tell us—

You republicans did not conquer our rebellion quite as cheaply as you ought to have done, you have not handled taxation and the public debt and the other consequences growing out of our treason as well as you ought to have done. Therefore we are indignant about it. You ought to have done this business better; you ought to have whipped us at half the expense, and you did not. We propose to take the Government out of your hands and ourselves to settle with and deal with the consequences of our own crimes and blunders.

Municipal reform and economy are necessary. No one doubts it. The city of New York is an example of this need. What reform has democracy instituted there? It has had an undisputed field. What has it accomplished? It has increased the city debt from \$30,000,000, in 1867, to over \$132,000,000 in 1873. Is this the kind of reform democracy would bring to the nation? If it is, our national debt would be nearly \$10,000,000,000 before the close of a single term of a democratic control. If democracy has done better than this in any other city where it has had control, let us have the name of the city and the character of the reform established.

As for the practice of economy in public expenditures, I believe in it. The republican party practice it. But saving money does not always indicate economy. You may refuse to build a light-house where one is needed and thereby save a few thousands of dollars, but you inflict an injury on commerce and on humanity which cannot be calculated in dollars and cents. You may refuse to finish a public building and thereby keep a few thousands in the Treasury, but the work is needed and must some time be executed. You have simply postponed payment. There is no economy in that. You may cut down your appropriation bills several millions, but you risk a serious injury to the public service which you have no right to incur. You may stop public improvements, discharge mechanics and laborers, shut up factories and workshops engaged on public works, and may call this economy, but it is not economy. You have set an example for those who have money and ought to spend it to withhold expenditures, shut down on labor, and thus you have con-

tributed to the general stagnation of business. Is this economy? You may call it economy, but the people next November will call it by its right name, political stupidity.

You may cut down the pay of the overworked and faithful letter-carriers, who serve the people early and late, through sunshine and storm, exposed to the fierce heat of summer and the extreme cold of winter, but this is not economy; it is legalized injustice, and will be so regarded when the people come to render their verdict.

You may reduce salaries established when Democracy was in power, and then none too large, when gold was the currency of the land, and when every article entering into household consumption was cheaper than now; but this is not economy, it is simply parsimony unequalled for by any exigency of the times, and indefensible on any grounds except those of partisan warfare.

You may save a few thousands of dollars by withdrawing the fast mails, and might appear to save more by returning to the old stage-coach system of transportation, but you cripple the postal service, and entail a loss direct and indirect on every business man who values quick dispatch and to whom the very earliest information has become a vital necessity. You may call this economy, and may argue on this floor that it is, but when you return to your constituents you will discover that you have committed a blunder that cannot be excused or justified on any grounds of public necessity.

True economy consults public interests, and may often be found in the increase rather than in the diminution of public expenditures. By refusing to appropriate sufficient money for the proper care of our navy yards, arsenals, mints, custom-houses and other public buildings that constantly need to be watched and repaired, you actually waste the public funds, for you entail upon subsequent years expenditures that would be unnecessary if a proper sum had been appropriated to care for and properly guard the property of the Government. The sailor who fails to stop a leak when he first sees it may discover when too late that his folly and neglect have cost him a ship.

It is not economy to refuse sufficient appropriations for the rivers and harbors scattered all over this broad land which can easily be made navigable by a reasonable expenditure, unless in the same bill you incorporate useless and reckless expenditures on "creeks that will not swim a duck," and where the engineers report that the first thing necessary is a steam-pump to pump up the water to start a river. And yet this is the character of economy we have seen practiced in this House, where the Democratic party is in power. I do not claim that Republican legislation is perfect, that errors have not been committed; but I do claim that it stands ready to punish its dishonest officials, correct its errors, and that the American people can with far more confidence intrust the administration of this Government in its hands than to turn it over to Democracy.

Again, we are told that reform is necessary in the civil service, and are further informed that—

"Experience proves that efficient economical conduct of the Governmental business is not possible if its civil service be subject to change at every election, be a prize fought for at the ballot-box, be a brief reward of party zeal instead of a post of honor assigned for proved competency, and held for fidelity in the public employ."

Does Democracy practice what it here preaches? Can it be claimed that the Republican officials, many of them wounded ex-Federal soldiers, who were removed by the majority of this House, were less efficient than the Democrats who were appointed to their places? If they were as efficient why were they removed? Everybody knows they were removed because they were Republicans. Had they been Democrats they would have been retained. I refer to the radical changes made in

the employees of this House since Democracy controlled it simply to show that the Democratic Solons of St. Louis differ very widely from the Democratic Solomons here assembled, or St. Louis was insincere in its pretensions. I prefer to believe the latter, for a close observation has convinced me that Democracy is about the same everywhere; it believes in Democracy, it surrounds itself with Democracy, it makes war on anything or everything that appears hostile to Democracy.

If officers should be held by men as a reward for competency, as a post of honor for fidelity in the public employ, why did the official axe decapitate men of tried ability and known integrity in this House? Why was it used so fiercely when Tilden replaced John A. Dix, and swept the State of New York of Republican officials? Why is it that in every State, county, town, or city, where Democracy controls the appointments, that none but Democrats are found in office? The answer is plain. It is simply because it is the policy of the party to surround itself by its friends; and in the full glare of this policy the reform alluded to in the St. Louis platform seems to be much out of place as a prayer-meeting would be in Tammany Hall. Again, allow me to exclaim, "Humbug, thy name is Democratic Reform."

There may be abuses which have crept into the Civil Service, but these can be corrected without destroying the party that has built up a civil service which is as honorable and as efficient as any in the world. To say that "the first step in reform must be the people's choice of honest men from another party," is to say that the only way to stop a leak is to destroy the ship and build another; or, to make an illustration more applicable, to destroy a vessel that is known to be staunch and sea-worthy and to replace it with one that is believed to be worm-eaten below the water-line and badly damaged above, and likely to go to pieces with the first blast of the elements.

Yes, reform is necessary, and always will be until the end of time; but how is it to be brought about? Our plan is to select the very best men in the Republican party, point out where reform is needed, and let them do the work, and bring to swift and certain punishment all dishonest officials. What is the Democratic plan? We have it announced in the platform. "Reform can only be had," says this oracular piece of timber, "by a peaceful civil revolution." Ominous words. The last attempt of a large portion of this same party at revolution was not "peaceful," though that promised in the beginning it would be. It failed; and now the same portion is to try the virtues of a peaceful revolution. Will it succeed? First let us ask, should it? Is there anything in the present condition of public affairs that would justify a revolution of any kind, peaceful or otherwise?

Our national policy is a good one. Our foreign relations are satisfactory. We are in the enjoyment of peace abroad and, with the exception of our Indian troubles, peace at home. Democracy asks for support on the grounds that it has accepted

the results of the war and the amendments of the Constitution as binding. If this is so, why the necessity of a revolution to bring out reform when every measure of the Republican party is in exact accord with the changed condition incident to these results and amendments? What is the meaning of revolution? It is something more than a change for the better, it is a complete overthrow of existing affairs, and whether it comes in the shape of politics or war, it leaves in its track a desolation that can only be justified by the plea that it was the last resort of an oppressed people. Webster says, in defining the term, "a *revolution* in politics is the consummation of a *rebellion* or *revolt* against the established or existing government." Is this "peaceful revolution" which the Democratic platform tells us is the only means whereby reform can be brought about "the consummation of a rebellion or revolt against the established or existing government?" If it is, then indeed the people should be informed of its character, and forewarned that its object is to secure by peaceful revolution what an armed rebellion failed to secure by the sword. If it is to be a revolt against the established Government, under the cover of politics, who that loves his country can hesitate in deciding on which side he belongs?

If the price to be paid for democratic reform is revolution, even though it be peaceful, the people will have none of it, but will reject it as they did the reform which was proclaimed in the bugle blasts of war and in the tread of mighty columns armed to enforce it.

Revolution is distasteful in any form to the American people. Whether peaceful or warlike they will accept it only as a last resort. That contingency has not yet arrived, nor will it as long as patriotism and loyalty remain in power. I have an abiding faith in the good sense of the majority, and I feel assured that whatever reform is to be brought about will be inaugurated by the party that has defended the nation in its hour of trial and guided it with unparalleled wisdom through eleven years of peace.

The voice of the people will be heard in November through the ballot-box, not calling democracy into power, but in a full, hearty indorsement of the republican party and the patriotic work that it has performed. The ballot has not yet failed us, and never will as long as patriotism, loyalty, and integrity are ruling elements in the land. On the ballot we rely for the vindication of our work and the purity of our motives. It is the true reformer that brings about improvement without revolution and corrects all wrongs without exciting rebellion or revolt. When its voice, denouncing democracy and sham reform, shall be heard, the revolutionists of the land will be forced to acknowledge that—

There is a weapon surer yet
And stronger than the bayonet;
A weapon that comes down as still
As snow-flakes fall upon the sod;
But executes a freeman's will
As lightning does the will of God.



